Exhibit A

Part 1 of 5

COPY OF TRANSCRIPT

VOLUME I
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AGERE SYSTEMS, INC., CYTEC INDUSTRIES, INC., FORD MOTOR COMPANY, SPS TECHNOLOGIES LLC and TI GROUP AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS LLC

Plaintiffs

V

CIVIL ACTION
NO.02-CV-3830 (LDD)

ADVANCED ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, ET AL. Defendants

Oral deposition of JAY

VANDEVEN, taken at the law offices of

Ballard Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll,

LLP, 1735 Market Street, 42nd Floor,

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on

Tuesday, February 13, 2007, at

9:59 a.m. before Jennifer Bermudez, a

Registered Professional Reporter, and

Notary Public, pursuant to notice.



James DeCrescenzo Reporting, LLC

INNOVATING LITIGATION
1880 JFK Blvd., 6th Floor • Philadelphia, PA 19103
www.jdreporting.com

ļ	
1	APPEARANCES:
2	BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, LLP
3	GLENN A. HARRIS, ESQUIRE
4	HARRISG@BALLARDSPAHR.COM Plaza 1000 - Suite 500
5	Main Street Voorhees, New Jersey 08043-4636
6	856-761-3440 Attorney for Plaintiffs
7	
	WOLFF & SAMSON, P.C.
8	THOMAS W. SABINO, ESQUIRE
~	tsabino@wolffsamson.com
9	
フ	The Offices at Crystal Lake One Boland Drive
ا ما	Une boland brive
LO	West Orange, New Jersey 07052
	973-530-2044
L1	Attorney For AETC
L2	
	PHELAN, PETTIT & BIEDRZYCKI
L3	JEFFREY L. PETTIT, ESQUIRE
	Jpettit@pp-b.com
4	121 S. Broad Street
,	Suite 1600
L5	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
	215-546-0500
L6	Attorneys for Ashland, Inc.
- -	
L7	
- 1	EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP
18	LYNN WRIGHT, ESQUIRE
	lwright@eapdlaw.com
19	750 Lexington Avenue
١٧	
2.0	New York, New York 10022
20	212-308-4411
~ <i>-</i>	Attorney for Carpenter Technology
21	Corp.
22	
23	
24	

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
2	CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN,
_	CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN
3	MELISSA E. FLAX, ESQUIRE mflax@carellabyrne.com
4	5 Becker Farm Road
_	Roseland, New Jersey 07068-1739
5	973-994-1700 Attorney for Handy & Harman Tube
6	Company
-,	
7	HINMAN, HOWARD & KATTELL, LLP
8	RALPH K. KESSLER, ESQUIRE
_	rkessler@hhk.com
9	106 Corporate Park Drive Suite 317
LO	White Plains, New York 10604
	914-694-4102
L1	Attorney for TI Automotive
L2	
L 2	DUANE, MORRIS, LLP
L3	SETH v.d.H. COOLEY, ESQUIRE
L 4	scooley@duanemorris.com 30 S. 17th Street
L 4	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
15	215-979-1000
	Attorney for Flexible Circuits
16	
17	LAW OFFICE OF EDWARD FACKENTHAL
18	EDWARD FACKENTHAL, ESQUIRE edwardfackenthal@cs.com
FO	One Montgomery Plaza
19	Suite 209
20	Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401 610-279-3370
20	Attorney for NRM Investment Co.
21	
22	
22	EXAMINATION INDEX
23	JAY VANDEVEN
.	BY MS. FLAX 6
24	BY MR. PETTIT 129

The state of the second

4

		STITON OF JAY VANDEVEN, VOLUME 1, 2/13/07	
1		EXHIBIT INDEX	
2	11 A N D D	MARKED	
3	VANDE		
4	1	EXPERT REPORT, JUNE 30, 7 2006	
5	2	E-MAIL FROM JAY VANDEVEN 16 TO MARK HAWLEY, MAY 18	
6		2006	
7	3	E-MAIL FROM MARK HAWLEY 19 TO JAY VANDEVEN, MAY 18	
8		2006	
9	4	E-MAIL FROM MARK HAWLEY 21 TO JAY VANDEVEN WITH	
10		ATTACHED DRAFT EXPERT REPORT, JUNE 26, 2006	
11	5	EXPERT REBUTTAL OPINIONS 58	
12	3	OF JAY VANDEVEN, NOVEMBER 15, 2006	
13	6	E-MAIL FROM MARK HAWLEY 83	
14		TO GLENN A. HARRIS NOVEMBER 15, 2006, WITH	
15		ATTACHED DRAFT EXPERT REBUTTAL OPINIONS OF JAY	
16		VANDEVEN	
17	7	E-MAIL FROM MARK HAWLEY 83 TO GLENN A. HARRIS	
18		NOVEMBER 15, 2006, WITH ATTACHED EXPERT REBUTTAL	
19		OPINIONS OF JAY VANDEVEN	
20	8	E-MAIL FROM MARK HAWLEY 119 TO JAY VANDEVEN, JUNE 26	
21		2006 WITH ATTACHED DRAFT EXPERT REPORT OF JAY	
22		VANDEVĖN	
23			
24			

5

-	201001	TION OI	OAI VANDEVEN,	, OHOLIM I, 2, 13,	70.
1	EXHIBI	T IND	EXX CONTINU	JED:	
2					MARKED
3			L FROM MARK Y VANDEVEN,		119
4	2	2006 1	WITH ATTACH T REPORT OF	ED DRAFT	
5		VANDE,		O 4.1 1	
6			L FROM MARK Y VANDEVEN,		119
7	:	2006	WITH ATTACH T REPORT OF	ED DRAFT	
8		VANDE			
9			L FROM JAY RK HAWLEY,		141
10		13, 2			
11	:	SCHUL	L FROM JENN TE TO MARK		141
12		JÜNE	26, 2006		
13					
14					
15					
16 17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
· -					

1	JAY VANDEVEN, having been
2	duly sworn, was examined and
3	testified as follows:
4	EXAMINATION
5	BY MS. FLAX:
6	Q. Good morning,
7	Mr. Vandeven. My name is Melissa
8	Flax, and I represent the defendant
9	Handy & Harman Tube Company in this
10	matter and you are here for your
11	deposition today.
12	I understand you have been
13	having some health problems, so if
14	you need to take a break at any time,
15	please let us know, just not while a
16	question is pending.
17	Are you taking any
18	medication today that would in any
19	way inhibit your ability to
20	understand my questions and to
21	respond truthfully?
22	A. No, I'm not.
23	Q. Have you previously been
24	deposed?

1	A. In this matter or ever?
2	Q. Have you ever been deposed
3	in any matter whatsoever?
4	A. Yes.
5	(Vandeven Exhibit 1 was
6	marked for identification.)
7	BY MS. FLAX:
8	Q. Mr. Vandeven, you have been
9	handed Vandeven 1. Can you tell me
10	what that is?
11	A. This is my June 30th, 2006
12	expert report in this matter.
13	Q. If you would turn to Page
14	A4 of Vandeven 1.
15	A. Page?
16	Q. A4.
17	A. I'm not sure what you mean
18	by A. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.
19	Q. You have a section entitled
20	Expert Testimony of Jay Vandeven. Is
21	that correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. You did not indicate
24	whether you gave deposition testimony

215.564.3905

1	and/or trial testimony in any of the
2	matters that are listed under that
3	section. Can you tell me whether or
4	not you were deposed in any or all
5	and whether you gave any trial
6	testimony?
7	A. Sure. I will just run down
8	them from top to bottom?
9	Q. Sure.
.0	A. In the Sun Oil matter, the
.1	first entry, I gave deposition
.2	testimony.
13	Q. And for whom?
.4	A. On behalf of Sun Oil. The
.5	second entry I represented Beazer
L6	East and I gave both deposition and
L7	trial testimony in that matter.
L8	The next entry, the third
L9	entry I represented 1325 G Street
20	Associates and provided deposition
21	testimony. For Fruehauf Production
22	Company, the fourth entry, that was
23	deposition testimony.
24	For Southern Natural Gas

1	Company I represented Southern	
2	Natural Gas and I gave both	
3	deposition and trial testimony in	
4	that matter. For Merck v. Amsted I	
5	gave deposition testimony and	
6	testified in an arbitration.	
7	And for GE versus AIG, I	
8	represented GE and gave deposition	
9	testimony and testified in an	
10	arbitration.	
11	Q. Is the question mark in the	
12	parenthetical a typo next to your	
13	entry for GE Capital?	
14	A. Yes. I didn't even see	
15	that. Yes.	
16	Q. So you are familiar with	
17	how a deposition works. Correct?	
18	A. Yes.	
19	Q. I'm just going to go over a	
20	few background questions just to make	
21	sure that you are fresh with these	
22	instructions.	
23	A. Okay.	
24	Q. You have been sworn in and	

1 you are obligated to give truthful 2 as though you were testifying answers 3 The court reporter sitting 4 left and your right can only to my 5 take down one individual at a time. 6 So while you may anticipate 7 what my question is, I would ask that 8 you wait until I complete my 9 question, and I will hopefully wait 10 until you complete your answer before 11 asking the next question. 12 Please vocalize all your 13 The court reporter can't answers. 14 take down nods, shrugs, uh-huh, 15 It just doesn't read well huh-uh. 16 the transcript. 17 Your attorney may pose 18 certain objections. In the absence 19 a direction not to answer, you are of 20 to answer the question. 21 If you don't understand a 22 question, tell me and I will rephrase 23 it. If you answer my question, I 24 will presume that you understood the

1	question as asked.
2	There are several other
3	attorneys sitting around this table.
4	Some may or may not ask you questions
5	when I conclude my questioning.
6	And as I said before, you
7	control the deposition, so if you
8	feel that you need a break to stretch
9	or use the restroom, for whatever the
10	reason may be, please indicate and we
11	will take a break to accommodate you.
12	In connection with your
13	deposition testimony, what did you do
14	to prepare?
15	A. I went back over my expert
16	report that you have provided in
17	Exhibit 1, also a rebuttal report
18	that I prepared.
19	I read back over some of
20	the underlying documents. I believe
21	I reviewed very briefly some of the
22	other expert reports in this matter.
23	I reviewed very briefly
24	some of the other deposition

1	transcripts of the other experts in
2	the matter that were provided after I
3	gave my or submitted my expert
4	report. And I met briefly with
5	counsel.
6	Q. Mr. Harris?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. You said you reviewed some
9	of the deposition transcripts of the
10	experts in this case. Can you tell
11	me which expert or experts you
12	reviewed?
13	A. I briefly reviewed the
14	transcript, I believe, of Mr. Brown
15	and Mr. Pease. I think I also
16	reviewed the transcripts of the
17	experts representing Ashland in this
18	matter.
19	MR. COOLEY: I'm sorry,
20	representing who?
21	THE WITNESS: Ashland.
22	BY MS. FLAX:
23	Q. Did you review both days of
24	Dr. Brown's deposition?

1	A. I believe so.
2	Q. About how long did you meet
3	with Mr. Harris?
4	A. For about maybe two and a
5	half hours.
6	Q. How many times in your
7	professional career have you worked
8	with Ballard, Spahr?
9	A. This is the first time I
10	have worked with Ballard, Spahr.
11	Q. How many times in your
12	professional career have you worked
13	with Glenn Harris?
14	A. This is the first time.
15	Q. Have you ever worked with
16	Cytec Industries or any of its
17	affiliates before this litigation?
18	A. I don't believe so, no.
19	Q. Have you ever worked with
20	SPS Technologies or any of its
21	affiliates prior to this litigation?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And in what capacity did
24	you work with SPS Technologies?

1	A. I worked for them on two	
2	matters, I believe. One was over ten	
3	years ago. I don't remember the	
4	exact nature of that matter.	
5	It was a cost allocation	
6	matter, I believe, on a number of	
7	properties that they owned, and they	
8	were the issue had to do with some	
9	allocation-related issue with a	
LO	component of SPS Arnold Engineering.	
11	I don't remember the exact	
12	nature of the matter.	
13	And then I also worked with	
14	SPS on an allocation matter at their	
15	Ogallala facility.	
16	Q. I'm sorry?	
17	A. Ogallala. Ogallala,	
18	Nebraska. It's two Ls.	
19	O-G-A-L-L-A-L-A, I believe. And I	
20	worked with SPS on an allocation-	
21	related groundwater issue at that	
22	site.	
23	Q. When you say you worked	
24	with SPS on these two previous	

1	matters, were you acting as a
2	consultant or were you acting as an
3	expert?
4	A. On the second matter I was
5	acting as an expert. I represented
6	them in a mediation.
7	Q. Was it a mediation that
8	took place while a lawsuit was
9	pending, or was it a mediation that
٠٥ ا	preceded the institution of any
L1	lawsuit?
L2	A. I don't recall.
L3	Q. In connection with the
L4	first matter that you mentioned, were
15	you serving as an expert or as a
L6	consultant for SPS?
17	A. I believe I was working as
1.8	a consultant in that matter.
19	Q. And do you know if that was
20	a litigated matter?
21	A. I don't remember, no.
22	Q. Have you ever worked with
23	Agere Systems or any of its
24	affiliates before this litigation?

1	A. No.
2	Q. Have you ever worked with
3	Western Electric or any of its
4	affiliates before this litigation?
5	(Discussion off the
6	record.)
7	
	BY MS. FLAX:
8	Q. I believe the last question
9	that I asked you is have you ever
10	worked with Western Electric or any
11	of its affiliates prior to this
12	litigation?
13	A. No, I have not.
14	Q. Have you ever worked with
15	Lucent or any of its affiliates prior
16	to this litigation?
17	A. No.
18	Q. Have you ever worked with
19	Ford Motor Company or any of its
20	affiliates prior to this litigation?
21	A. No, I have not.
22	(Vandeven Exhibit 2 was
23	marked for identification.)
24	BY MS. FLAX:
	<u> </u>

1	Q. Mr. Vandeven, you have been
2	handed a document that's been marked
3	Vandeven-2, which was produced to me
4	by plaintiff's counsel as part of
5	your work file. Do you recognize
6	this document?
7	A. I don't I can't say that
8	I recognize this specific e-mail. I
9	recognize the format of this
LO	document.
L1	Q. Well, can you review the
12	contents of this e-mail?
13	A. Sure. I'm going to get my
14	glasses.
15	Q. Sure.
16	Have you had an opportunity
17	to review that e-mail?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. First let me ask you, who
20	is Mark Hawley?
21	A. Mark Hawley is a
22	hydrogeologist in my office that
23	works with me.
24	Q. I will come back to

1	Mr. Hawley momentarily. In this	
2	e-mail, the last line well, the	
3	last portion of this e-mail says	
4	"Second, can you give me a brief	
5	summary of what was wrong with the	
6	probabilistic analysis they did in	
7	2000."	
8	What is a probabilistic	
9	analysis?	
10	A. In this case or in general?	
11	Q. Well, this e-mail is from	
12	you to Mr. Hawley, so what your	
13	understanding of the phrase	
14	probabilistic analysis was as you	
15	wrote those words in this e-mail?	
16	A. I don't recall what I was	
17	referring to with respect to this	
18	case and a probabilistic analysis.	
19	Q. Why don't you tell me what	
20	your general understanding is	
21	initially of the phrase probabilistic	
22	analysis?	
23	A. A probabilistic analysis is	
24	an analysis of the occurrence of an	

1	activity associating a set of
2	probabilities with the likelihood of
3	that occurrence happening.
4	So it's the opposite of a
5	deterministic analysis. It's not a
6	single number, it's a range or a set
7	of numbers that have a different
8	probability associated with them.
9	(Vandeven Exhibit 3 was
10	marked for identification.)
11	BY MS. FLAX:
12	Q. Mr. Vandeven, if you would
13	take a moment to read what's been
14	marked as Vandeven-3, and let me know
15	when you have completed that.
16	A. Okay.
17	Q. This is an e-mail from Mark
18	Hawley replying to your e-mail which
19	we have marked as Vandeven-2.
20	Correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And in Mr. Hawley's
23	response to your e-mail, which we
24	have marked as Vandeven-2, he says,

1	"I will leave a brief explanation of
2	my concerns about the prob analysis
3	for you as a voice message.
4	"We can talk about it more
5	tomorrow or call me back tonight if
6	you want to."
7	Do you see that?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Does this refresh your
10	recollection as to what the
11	probabilistic analysis was that you
12	wrote in your e-mail which has been
13	marked Vandeven-2?
14	A. No, it doesn't.
15	Q. Do you recall a voice mail
16	message from Mr. Hawley relating to
17	his concerns about the probabilistic
18	analysis?
19	A. No, I don't.
20	Q. Do you recall any
21	conversations with Mr. Hawley either
22	telephonically or in person where you
23	discussed problems or concerns with
24	the probabilistic analysis?

1	A. No, I don't.
2	(Vandeven Exhibit 4 was
3	marked for identification.)
4	BY MS. FLAX:
5	Q. Mr. Vandeven, you have been
6	handed a document that we have marked
7	as Vandeven-4, and I just have a few
8	questions relating to this document.
9	If you would turn to Page 2
10	of the attachment. First of all, if
11	you will go to the first page of the
12	attachment, on the lower left-hand
13	corner there is a date that says
14	12/28/06. What is that date?
15	A. I couldn't say for sure.
16	Q. Well, do you have any
17	information as to what this date
18	means?
19	A. No, I don't.
20	Q. Turning back to Page 2 of
21	Vandeven-4, in paragraph number two
22	there appears to be a little more
23	than three lines that are blacked
24	out. Do you see that?
	<u> </u>

1	
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. What is that? What is
3	being blacked out?
4	A. I don't know.
5	Q. Why is that blacked out?
6	A. I don't know.
7	Q. Did you compile your work
8	file for plaintiff's counsel in
9	connection with responding to the
10	deposition notice?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Do you recall intentionally
13	blacking out certain portions of
14	drafts that were contained in your
15	file?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Is it your practice that
18	drafts would have blacked-out
19	portions?
20	A. No.
21	Q. Do you have any explanation
22	as to why these three plus lines are
23	blacked out?
24	A. No, I don't.

г	
1	Q. All right. If you would
2	turn to Page 5 of Vandeven-2, and if
3	I asked you the same questions that I
4	just asked you, would your responses
5	be the same?
6	MR. COOLEY: Excuse me,
7	Vandeven-4?
8	MS. FLAX: Vandeven-4.
9	Sorry.
10	MR. COOLEY: What is the
11	date of Vandeven-4?
1.2	MS. FLAX: The e-mail is
13	dated June 26, 2006.
14	MR. FACKENTHAL: Will you
15	describe what it is?
16	MS. FLAX: I'm sorry.
17	Vandeven-4 is an e-mail dated June
18	26, 2006 from Mark Hawley to Jay
19	Vandeven attaching a draft of
20	Mr. Vandeven's report in this matter.
21	MR. COOLEY: And I'm sorry,
22	the date on the cover sheet of that
23	draft is?
24	MR. FACKENTHAL: Did she

1	say June 26th?
2	MS. FLAX: The draft says
3	June 24th, 2006.
4	MR. COOLEY: Thank you.
5	BY MS. FLAX:
6	Q. Going back to the
7	questions, I asked you to turn to
8	Page 5 of Vandeven-4, and if I asked
9	you the same questions that I asked
10	you about Page 2, would your response
11	be the same, that you don't know what
12	is being blacked out?
13	A. That's correct, yes.
14	Q. And if I asked you to turn
15	to Page 9 and again asked you the
16	same questions, would your response
17	be the same?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And lastly, on Vandeven-4,
20	if you turn to Page 10, and I ask you
21	the same questions regarding the
22	blacked-out portions of this draft
23	report, would your response be the
24	same?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Who would know what was
3	contained in these blacked-out
4	portions of your report?
5	A. I don't know.
6	Q. Well, Mr. Vandeven, they
7	don't just appear out of nowhere.
8	Someone had to intentionally make
9	these blackouts.
10	So who in your office do
11	you believe would have information or
12	knowledge as to either A, why this
13	was done, or B, what was contained?
14	A. I doubt that anybody in
15	my this is not something that we
16	ever do, black out portions of text
17	like this, so I don't know who would
18	have information about this. I don't
19	know who what portions were
20	blacked out, why, or who did it.
21	Q. When you were reviewing and
22	compiling your work file for
23	Mr. Harris, did you see on any of
24	your drafts blacked-out portions?
	·

1	A. No.
2	MR. HARRIS: Can we go off
3	the record for a second?
4	MS. FLAX: Sure.
5	(Discussion off the
6	record.)
7	BY MS. FLAX:
8	Q. In connection with your
9	preparation of Vandeven-1, did you
10	have any telephone conversations with
11	either Mr. Harris, any other attorney
12	at Ballard, Spahr and/or any
13	representative of the plaintiffs?
1.4	A. Yes.
15	Q. And do you recall how many
16	telephone conversations you had in
17	connection with your preparation of
18	Vandeven-1?
19	A. With Glenn Harris or with
20	anybody in that group that you
21	Q. Well, let's start with
22	Mr. Harris.
23	A. I would say with Mr. Harris
24	I probably had on the order of maybe

1	four or five conversations.
2	Q. And what was the content of
3	those conversations?
4	A. Generally related to what
5	the objectives were and what
6	schedule, and then some conversations
7	about the opinions that I was
8	reaching.
9	Q. What were the objectives?
10	A. Well, the objectives that I
11	was given was to develop two basic
12	opinions on this matter.
13	Q. And those are the two basic
14	opinions that are contained in
15	Vandeven-1?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. What were your
18	conversations about regarding your
19	opinions themselves?
20	A. I'm sorry, can you repeat
21	that?
22	Q. You indicated that in your
23	four or five conversations with
24	Mr. Harris you discussed your

1	objectives, your schedule, or the
2	schedule, I should say, and you had
3	some conversations regarding your
4	opinions.
5	So my question is, what was
6	the substance of those conversations
7	regarding your opinions?
8	A. It had to do with after we
9	reviewed after I reviewed the
10	documents what opinions I was
11	reaching, the basis of those
12	opinions, how I saw my report being
13	developed.
14	Q. During the course of these
15	four or five telephone conversations,
16	did you take any notes of what was
17	being said?
18	A. No.
19	Q. During the course of these
20	four or five telephone conversations,
21	did any of them relate to comments on
22	your June 30th report that's been
23	marked as Vandeven-1?
24	A. I don't remember if they

FAX 215.751.0581

1	were comments specifically on this
2	report, no.
3	Q. You don't recall whether or
4	not Mr. Harris or any other attorney
5	at Ballard, Spahr offered comments to
6	what was ultimately your final report
7	dated June 30th, 2006. Is that
8	correct?
9	A. I recall them offering
10	Mr. Harris offering. I didn't talk
11	to any other attorney at Ballard,
12	Spahr. I recall Mr. Harris offering
13	some minor comments on a draft
14	report, but nothing more than that.
15	Q. And when you say minor
16	comments, tell me what you mean by
17	minor comments.
18	A. Editorial format-related
19	comments.
20	Q. Now, when I originally
21	started asking you this line of
22	questioning I asked you whether you
23	had spoken to Mr. Harris, any other
24	attorney at Ballard, Spahr or any

www.JDReporting.com

1	representative or representatives of
2	plaintiffs and you asked me which
3	ones do I want first.
4	So now I'm going to ask you
5	about any conversations you had with
6	any of the plaintiffs'
7	representatives in connection with
8	your June 30th, 2006 report.
9	A. Okay. Is there a question
10	there?
11	Q. Did you speak with any
12	representative from any one or more
13	of the plaintiffs in connection with
14	the preparation of your June 30th,
15	2006 report?
16	A. On, I can remember, two
17	telephone conversations that I had
18	with Mr. Harris where at least one
19	other individual was on the phone.
20	Q. Do you know who that
21	individual was?
22	A. The person that I remember
23	is Tom Mesevage.
24	Q. Do you recall whether other

- 1	
1	than Tom Mesevage, any other
2	plaintiffs' representative
3	participated in these discussions?
4	A. Dennis. And I don't recall
5	Dennis's last name, but it would be
6	Dennis at SPS.
7	Q. Would it be Dennis Shea?
8	A. Dennis Shea.
9	Q. Did either Mr. Mesevage or
.0	Mr. Shea offer comments to what was
.1	ultimately your June 30, 2006 report?
L2	A. I don't believe that they
_3	did, no.
L4	Q. Do you recall the contents
L5	of any conversations that you had
L6	with them on those one or two
17	conversations?
18	A. I don't recall. All I
19	recall is that they were on the
20	phone.
21	Q. If you would turn to
22	Vandeven-1, please. You indicated
23	that your assignment was limited to
24	what you call two basic opinions that

1	are contained on Page 1 of your
2	report. Is that correct?
3	A. That's correct, yes.
4	Q. And those opinions are
5	found in the Paragraphs 1 and 2 that
6	are in nonitalics format. Is that
7	correct?
8	A. The opinions are in the
9	italics on Page 1.
LO	Q. Okay. The nonitalics
L1	Paragraphs 1 and 2 are the
12	objectives?
13	A. Yes. Those were the
L4	general topics I was asked to look
L5	at.
16	Q. If you would turn to Page
17	12 of Vandeven-1. In the second
18	bullet on Vandeven-1, the last
19	sentence you offer your opinion
20	regarding the PRP group's cost.
21	And you further state, "The
22	anticipated costs associated with
23	ongoing performance of the RD/RA
24	under the terms of the consent
	1

decrees are reasonable given the
requirements of the ROD and the
characteristics of the site."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did I read that accurately?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the basis for your
offering an opinion as to future
costs?
A. Well, the opinion that I'm
offering there is whether or not
those future costs and the activities
associated with those are reasonable
given the requirements of the ROD.
Q. Well, do you know what the
future costs are?
A. Not specifically, no. But
the activities that will be will
necessitate the incurrence of those
costs are reasonable and will be done
consistent with the ROD.
Q. But if activities are
reasonable, does that necessarily

1	follow that the costs associated with
2	those activities are reasonable?
3	A. I wouldn't say necessarily,
4	no.
5	Q. So isn't that portion of
6	your opinion really speculative
7	because you don't know what the
8	costs what the future costs
9	actually are?
ro	A. But this is you asked
11	your question in kind of a general
12	hypothetical.
13	This is the situation where
14	the costs or the activities are going
15	to be incurred at a site where EPA is
16	determining what needs to be done,
17	what activities need to be done.
18	And therefore those
19	response costs will be incurred for
20	activities that are necessary and
21	required at the site.
22	Q. I wasn't asking you in a
23	hypothetical. I was asking you
24	because you offer an opinion as to

1	future costs.
2	I understand that EPA is
3	going to be involved. I understand
4	that there were certain activities
5	that must be undertaken at the site
6	in order to fulfill the requirements
7	of the ROD.
8	But that does not mean that
9	the costs associated with those
10	activities are necessarily
11	reasonable. Is that correct?
12	A. I would say that ultimately
13	you would have to look at the
14	individual costs, but in a case
15	like in a situation like this
16	where the activities are required by
17	EPA, that the activities are
18	necessary and therefore the costs
19	incurred for those will be
20	reasonable.
21	Q. How do you know that those
22	costs will be reasonable?
23	A. Because it's going to be
24	conducted in accordance with and

1	under the direction of EPA.
2	Q. How does the fact that the
3	EPA is overseeing the cleanup that is
4	being performed by some of the
5	plaintiffs under consent decrees
6	necessarily mean that the costs that
7	may be incurred in the future in
8	connection with future necessary
9	activities will be reasonable?
10	A. That's just the way that
11	I that's the way that I look at
12	it. If the activity is required by
13	the EPA, and it's done in accordance
14	with EPA regulations, then the costs
15	that are incurred for that activity
16	are reasonable response costs.
17	Q. But EPA doesn't pay these
18	costs. Correct?
19	A. In this situation, no.
20	Q. I'm in this situation.
21	A. PRPs are doing this work.
22	Q. So EPA is not paying for
23	the costs, the PRPs have their own
24	consultant, engineer who are

1	overseeing the project for the PRPs	
2	and they hire somebody who charges	
3	exorbitant prices. The EPA is not	
4	going to see those bills. Correct?	
5	A. I can't say that	
6	categorically, no, that the EPA I	
7	mean, if you have an EPA order, if	
8	you are doing work like this in	
9	conjunction with the EPA, the EPA has	
LO	access to your consultant, they have	
i1	to approve your consultant very	
L2	often, so it's not done in a vacuum.	
L3	The EPA certainly has	
14	knowledge of the consultant that you	
15	are hiring, the consultant and	
16	contractors that are doing the work	
17	and how they are doing the work.	
18	Q. But that doesn't translate	
19	into the EPA having control over what	
20	a particular contractor hired by the	
21	PRPs charges the PRPs for actually	
22	performing the activities that are	
23	required under the ROD?	
24	A. What they charge them as an	

1	hourly rate?	
2	Q. Their bills, their monthly	
3	bills for performing the activities	
4 _	that.are.required_under_the_ROD	
5	A. No. I would say that EPA	
6	doesn't have control over what their	
7	monthly bills are, no.	
8	Q. Okay. So with that said,	
9	the PRPs are performing what is	
LO	required under the ROD and they have	
11	a consultant who was approved by the	
L2	EPA but is not being paid by the EPA	
13	is being paid by the PRPs and they	
14	are performing necessary activities	
15	in order to comply with the	
16	objectives of the ROD, does it	
17	necessarily follow that the costs are	
18	reasonable?	
19	A. I would say in that	
20	situation, yes, the costs are	
21	reasonable.	
22	Q. And what's the basis for	
23	your saying that?	
24	A. The basis for me saying	

that would be, again, that the EPA is involved in both the work that required and overseeing the work that in having a stake in seeing is done, that the work is done correctly. And knowing that if the activity is specified and required by the EPA that the contractors and consultants carrying out that work will incur costs that are reasonable response costs. If you would turn to Page 7 Ο. of Vandeven-1. You indicate that you received a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering from Clemson University in 1982. What was your major course of study for your undergraduate degree? Α. Up until my senior year it was kind of traditional civil engineering, which was a broad discipline that included both

hydrology, hydrogeology, and then

structures and building disciplines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	In my senior year I focused
2	on the environmental engineering
3	aspects of civil engineering.
4	Q. Can you expound further for
5	me what your studies entailed in your
6	senior year that focused on
7	environmental engineering?
8	A. They included courses
9	related to water and wastewater
10	treatment, how chemicals the
11	sources of chemicals in the
12	environment, how they behave in the
13	environment, water chemistry.
14	Q. And you further state on
15	Page 7 that you received a master of
16	science degree in civil engineering
17	from Clemson University as well in
18	1985.
19	At any time between the
20	completion of your undergraduate
21	degree and your master's of science,
22	did you work as an engineering
23	professional?
24	A. Yes, I did.

, [O and whome did now work?
1	Q. And where did you work?
2	A. At the Savannah River Plant
3	in South Carolina.
4	Q. And what did you do at the
5	Savannah River Plant in South
6	Carolina?
7	A. I worked on determining the
8	fate and behavior of tritium from
9	their low-level waste burial sites.
10	Q. You said of tritium?
11	A. Tritium.
12	Q. Can you spell that?
13	A. T-R-I-T-I-U-M.
14	Q. What is tritium?
15	A. It's heavy water. It's a
16	water molecule with three hydrogens
17	in it. It's used in nuclear weapons.
18	Q. What research did you do
19	for your master's degree?
20	A. My master's degree focused
21	on the fate and behavior of cesium-
22	137 and cobalt-60 from a nuclear
23	power plant near Clemson University.
24	Q. Could you just give me a

1	little more explanation as to what
2	your research was?
3	A. Well, when you break
4	uranium apart you have fission
5	products. The two predominant ones
6	are cesium-137 and cobalt-60. Any
7	nuclear power plant releases those.
8	They release the
9	wastewater from this particular power
10	plant went into a large freshwater
11	lake, and I looked at how those
12	chemicals how those radioactive
13	chemicals behaved in the lake system.
14	Q. Are you a professional
15	engineer?
16	A. I do not have a
17	professional engineering license, no.
18	Q. Staying on Page 7 of
19	Vandeven-1, you state that you worked
20	for the consulting firm of CH2M HILL
21	from 1987 to 1993 as a senior
22	environmental engineer.
23	My question is, you
24	received your master's in 1985 and in

1	1987 you are suggesting that you were
2	a senior environmental engineer.
3	And I'm curious how you go
4	in a year and a half from being a
5	student to being a senior
6	environmental engineer. So my
7	question to you is how do you do
8	that?
9	A. My first employment after
10	my master's degree was with Environ
11	Corporation from 1985 to late 1986,
12	at which time I went to CH2M HILL.
13	My title when I first went
14	to CH2M HILL was probably more a
15	staff engineer. When I left CH2M
16	HILL I was a senior engineer project
17	manager.
18	Q. And when did you leave CH2M
19	HILL?
20	A. I believe in June 1994.
21	Q. How long were you a staff
22	engineer for CH2M HILL?
23	A. Oh, I would say probably my
24	first two or three years there.

1	Q. And what were your job
2	duties and responsibilities as a
3	staff engineer?
4	A
5	projects primarily relating to the
6	investigation and remediation of
7	contaminated sites.
8	Q. Any particular type of
9	contaminated sites?
10	A. I worked both on large
11	Superfund sites, and then also
12	contaminated properties for private
13	plants, primarily the duPont
14	Corporation.
15	Q. And what was your next
16	title after you were staff engineer
17	for two or three years at CH2M HILL?
18	A. It was likely a project
19	manager and then progressing to
20	project manager and senior engineer.
21	Q. For approximately how long
22	were you a project manager?
23	A. I would say approximately
24	two years.

1	Q. And what were your job
2	duties and responsibilities as
3	project manager?
4	A. They didn't really change
5	much. Still working on the same
6	kinds of sites but just taking more
7	responsibility associated with client
8	coordination and administrative
9	aspects of the projects.
LO	Q. And then your last title
L1	while you were employed by CH2M HILL
12	was senior project manager. Is that
13	correct?
L 4	A. I don't recall exactly what
15	it was, but I was a senior project
16	manager and environmental engineer.
17	Q. What were your job duties
18	and responsibilities as senior
19	project manager, environmental
20	engineer?
21	A. The same, just generally
22	associated with larger cases, larger
23	sites.
24	Q. You testified that you do

1	not that you are not a
2	professional engineer. Correct?
3	A. Correct.
4	Q. Do you know what the
5	requirements for certification of a
6	professional engineer in Virginia,
7	since that's where you are from?
8	A. I believe you have to have
9	an undergraduate degree in a
10	engineering discipline. And I
11	believe to sit for your exam you have
12	to have five years of relevant
13	experience.
14	Q. What do you mean five years
15	of relevant experience?
16	A. Five years working as an
17	engineer.
18	Q. And would that be working
19	as an engineer in a particular
20	discipline?
21	A. Not a particular
22	discipline. Any of the traditional
23	engineering disciplines, I believe.
24	Q. While you were employed at

1	CH2M HILL, did you work at the
2	Boarhead Farms Superfund site?
3	A. When I was with CH2M HILL I
4	was involved in our what we refer
5	to as our ARCS contract with EPA
6	Region 3, and I was involved in that
7	contract and Boarhead Farms was one
8	of the sites that CH2M HILL was
9	working on under that contract.
LO	So I did work very briefly
11	on the Boarhead Farms site.
L2	Q. Okay. You need to educate
13	me. What's an ARCS contract?
14	A. I believe ARCS stood for
15	Alternative Remedial Contracting.
16	Q. And CH2M HILL had a
17	contractual relationship with Region
18	3 of the EPA?
19	A. That's correct.
20	Q. And under the umbrella of
21	that contract the Boarhead Farms
22	Superfund site was one of several
23	Superfund sites that CH2M HILL was
24	providing services to the EPA?

1	A. That's correct.
2	Q. Do you recall when you
3	became involved under this contract
4	with the Boarhead Farms Superfund
5	site?
6	A. It was at the very early
7	stages, 19 maybe '88 or '89.
8	Q. And do you recall how long
9	you continued to work at the Boarhead
LO	site?
11	MR. HARRIS: Objection. He
12	didn't say he worked at the Boarhead
13	site.
14	MS. FLAX: I will withdraw
15	the question and I will re-ask the
16	question.
17	BY MS. FLAX:
18	Q. Did you personally have any
19	involvement with the activities that
20	CH2M HILL was performing at the
21	Boarhead Farms Superfund site?
22	A. The only activity that I
23	recall being involved in personally
24	was contracting subcontracting an

ı	i
1	individual to do a cultural resource
2	survey, which is a requirement under
3	the NCP.
4	Q. Do you recall who that
5	individual was?
6	A. No, I don't.
7	Q. Can you explain what the
8	survey was?
9	A. I only remember it very,
10	very it's very sketchy. That's
11	conducting a cultural resource survey
12	is a requirement under the national
13	contingency plan.
14	There was indication even
15	early on that there were some
16	structures at the site that may have
17	some cultural significance.
18	So EPA is required I
19	think it's actually under it may
20	not be under the NCP, it may be under
21	NPO, that they have to do a cultural
2,2	resource assessment of those
23	structures to determine how they need
24	to be protected and so forth.

1	I think it had to do with
2	the farm house there.
3	Q. Explain to me what is meant
4	by a cultural resource survey. Is it
5	like whether something is
6	historical, to be preserved?
7	A. Correct. I think early on
8	there was some indication that the
9	building itself could have been built
10	by William Penn, so there was some
11	if EPA was going to go in
12	MR. HARRIS: You thought
13	you had heard everything in this
14	case, right?
14	
15	THE WITNESS: So this was
	THE WITNESS: So this was my only involvement in Boarhead
15	
15 16	my only involvement in Boarhead
15 16 17	my only involvement in Boarhead Farms, so I remember it like this,
15 16 17 18	my only involvement in Boarhead Farms, so I remember it like this, that it was just this pristine farm
15 16 17 18	my only involvement in Boarhead Farms, so I remember it like this, that it was just this pristine farm that had one or more buildings that
15 16 17 18 19 20	my only involvement in Boarhead Farms, so I remember it like this, that it was just this pristine farm that had one or more buildings that could have dated back to pre
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	my only involvement in Boarhead Farms, so I remember it like this, that it was just this pristine farm that had one or more buildings that could have dated back to pre Revolutionary War times.

1	needed to understand, not unlike you
2	have to do in Native American lands,
3	understand what the cultural
4	significance is of those structures.
5	And if they do have
6	cultural significance, then protect
7	them as you go about investigating.
8	BY MS. FLAX:
9	Q. Did you ever, either while
10	you were at CH2M HILL or while you
11	were at Environ visit the Boarhead
12	Farms Superfund site?
13	A. I did once when I was with
14	CH2M HILL, yes.
15	Q. Have you been back there?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Other than subcontracting
18	with an individual to conduct a
19	cultural resource survey, did you
20	have any other involvement with the
21	Boarhead Farms Superfund site under
22	the ARCS contract with EPA Region 3?
23	A. Nothing that I can
24	remember, no.

1	Q. How long was your
2	involvement with the cultural
3	resource survey?
4	A. It was very brief, on the
5	order of a month, I would say.
6	Q. So you were not a project
7	manager or a site manager for the
8	Boarhead Farms Superfund site?
9	A. I don't know if I was ever
LO	referred to as a site manager of the
11	Boarhead Farms site. How they may
L2	have designated people to EPA, I'm
13	not sure, but I don't believe so.
1.4	' I believe the site manager
L5	for the Boarhead Farms site was a
L6	woman in the Philadelphia office of
17	CH2M HILL.
18	Q. Do you recall whether you
19	had any involvement while at CH2M
20	HILL after 1990 with the Boarhead
21	Farms Superfund site?
22	A. I don't remember the time
23	frame. It was right around then,
24	maybe say '88, '89, '90. I can't

1	remember the exact time frame.
2	Q. Do you recall whether you
3	contributed to the preparation of the
4	draft RI/FS work plan?
5	A. I don't believe I did, no.
6	Q. Did you contribute to the
7	final RI/FS work plan?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Do you know whether CH2M
10	HILL participated in the two removal
11	actions for buried drums in
12	contaminated soil that was performed
13	by EPA?
14	A. I don't know if they did or
15	not. That was certainly after my
16	involvement.
17	Q. Did you have any
18	participation in the preparation of
19	the federal on-scene coordinators
20	report?
21	A. No.
22	Q. Do you even know what
23	report I'm talking about?
24	A. I know generically what

1	that kind of report is, but I don't
2	know specifically for this site what
3	report you are referring to.
4	Q Would you turn to Page 13
5	of Vandeven-1.
6	Do you hold your Opinion 2
7	to a reasonable degree of scientific
8	certainty?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Do you hold the basis for
11	Opinion 2 to a reasonable degree of
12	scientific certainty?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. On a scale from 1 to 100,
1.5	from 1 percent to 100 percent, what
16	percentage of certainty would you
17	ascribe to constitute a reasonable
	1
18	degree of scientific certainty?
18 19	degree of scientific certainty? MR. HARRIS: Objection.
19	MR. HARRIS: Objection.
19 20 21 22	MR. HARRIS: Objection. You are assuming that he does it that
19 20 21	MR. HARRIS: Objection. You are assuming that he does it that way.

1	that way.
2	BY MS. FLAX:
3	Q. Well, if I asked you to
4	tell me what you believe is a
5	reasonable degree of scientific
6	certainty, how do you answer that
7	question?
8	A. Well, I would very likely
9	answer it a lot more qualitative than
LO	giving you a precise percentage.
11	I would say that a
12	reasonable degree of scientific
13	certainty is based on and refers to a
14	conclusion that I reach based on the
15	totality of an evaluation. It's
16	not it doesn't have any specific
17	percentage associated with it.
18	Q. Well, you would agree that
19	50 percent is not a reasonable degree
20	of scientific certainty. Correct?
21	A. 50 percent of what?
22	Q. If you were only 50 percent
23	certain of your opinion, you would
24	not say that that's within a

1	reasonable degree of scientific	
2	certainty. Correct?	
3	A. If I was doing an analysis	
4	and reaching an opinion that allowed	
5	me to associate a specific percentage	
6	with it and that percentage was 50	
7	percent, I would say that that was	
8	not a reasonable degree of scientific	
9	certainty.	
LO	Q. Do you have any level of	
11	comfort in giving me what percentage	
12	you believe an opinion would qualify	
13	as one that was within a reasonable	
14	degree of scientific certainty?	
15	A. A percentage? No.	
16	Q. On Page 13 of Vandeven-1 in	
17	the first bullet point you say, "The	
18	PA report indicates that bulk	
19	releases of ferric chloride, copper	
20	ammonium carbonate, ammonia and	
21	sulfuric acid were documented."	
22	Do you see that?	
23	A. Yes.	
24	Q. Did the Handy & Harman	

FAX 215.751.0581

7	
1	facility generate ferric chloride as
2	a waste?
3	A. I don't know.
4	Q. Did the Handy & Harman
5	facility generate copper ammonium
6	carbonate as a waste?
7	A. I don't know what you
8	referring to. This facility that you
9	are referring to I don't have any
10	information on.
11	Q. In connection with your
12	retention in this matter, did you
13	review any information regarding the
14	defendants?
15	A. To the extent that I
16	reviewed the other expert reports in
17	this matter, which contained
18	information about specific waste
19	streams.
20	MR. HARRIS: Time for a
21	break?
22	MS. FLAX: Sure.
23	(Recess taken)
24	(Vandeven Exhibit 5 was

1	marked for identification.)
2	BY MS. FLAX:
3	Q. Mr. Vandeven, you have been
4	handed Vandeven-5 Can you please
5	tell me what Vandeven-5 is?
6	A. This is my November 15th,
7	2006 Rebuttal Expert Report.
8	Q. Okay. And if you would
9	turn to Page 1 of Vandeven-5.
10	The first paragraph
11	following the bullets says, and I
12	quote, "I have also reviewed the
13	expert report prepared on behalf of
14	the plaintiffs by Jurgen H. Exner of
15	JHE Technology Systems, Inc.
16	I have also reviewed the
17	documents Dr. Exner relied upon which
18	are listed in his report. I accept
19	and agree with Dr. Exner's
20	descriptions of the wastes associated
21	with various industries and
22	defendants."
23	Do you see that?
24	A. Yes.

1	Q. Did I read that accurately?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. What exactly did you review
4	of the documents that Dr. Exner
5	relied upon that allowed you to
6	accept and agree with Dr. Exner's
7	descriptions of the wastes associated
8	with various industries and
9	defendants?
10	A. I believe there I was
11	looking primarily at his description
12	of some of the acid wastes that were
13	disposed of at the site to determine
14	if there was information if he had
15	more specific information in his
16	expert report in the documents that
17	he based his opinion on regarding the
18	type of acids they may have been, how
19	strong those acids were.
20	That was the primary reason
21	I went back and looked at his report
22	and the documents that he relied on.
23	Q. So is it fair to say that
24	you did not review any documents that

1	Dr. Exner relied upon with respect to	
2	Handy & Harman Tube Company?	
3	A. I'm not sure I frankly	
4	don't I'm not sure who Handy &	
5	Harman is. I really never concerned	
6	myself with particular companies in	
7	this matter, so	
8	Q. So if I asked you about any	
9	of the wastes generated at Handy &	
10	Harman, you would have no knowledge	
11	one way or the other. Correct?	
12	A. I would have no specific	
13	knowledge, no.	
14	Q. Well, what general	
1.5	knowledge would you have?	
16	A. I don't have any knowledge	
17	sitting here today about what	
18	there may be information in the	
19	documents that I have been provided	
20	in this matter, but I don't have any	
21	information specific or general about	
22	their wastes, sitting here right now.	
23	Q. Turning back to Vandeven-1,	

1	report. I would ask you to take a
2	moment and read the four bulleted
3	points that are on Page 15 of
4	Vandeven-1.
5	A. Okay.
6	Q. Nowhere in those four
7	bullet points do you mention Handy &
8	Harman Tube Company or the Handy &
9	Harman facility. Correct?
10	A. You mean
11	Q. Handy & Harman Tube Company
12	or the Handy & Harman facility.
13	Correct?
14.	A. That's correct.
15	Q. And nowhere in those four
16	bullet points do you attribute any of
17	the wastes ascribed to Handy & Harman
18	Tube Company. Is that correct?
19	A. I don't know if any of
20	these wastes are related to Handy &
21	Harman Tube Company.
22	Q. Nowhere on Page 15 does
23	your report state that waste from
24	Handy & Harman Tube Company or the

215.564.3905

1	Handy & Harman facility was disposed
2	of at the Boarhead site. Is that
3	correct?
4	
5	Q. And it's fair to say that
6	nowhere in your report do you state
7	that waste from Handy & Harman Tube
8	Company or the Handy & Harman
9	facility disposed of wastes at the
10	site. Is that correct?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. In the first bullet point
13	on Page 15 the first line says, "The
14	wastes disposed of at the site may
15	have included pickle liquors."
16	Do you see that?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Does the phrase "may have"
19	equate with a reasonable degree of
20	scientific certainty?
21	A. I would say that that
22	refers to the fact that the
23	information that I relied on for that
24	had similar language in the ROD or in

1 other underlying documents relating 2 to whether or not pickle liquors were 3 disposed of at the site. 4 Okay. But regardless of 5 how something may have been phrased 6 in a document, do you believe that 7 use of the words "may have" rise to 8 the level of a reasonable degree of 9 scientific certainty? 10 Well, I'm not sure I would 11 associate the two concepts. This is 12 not an opinion, all right. I'm not 13 saying that it's my opinion that 14 wastes disposed of at the site may have included pickle liquors. 15 16 The underlying information 17 about the site indicates that pickle 18 liquors may have been disposed of at 19 the site. 20 My opinion, then, 21 there were, would those constituents 22 of the pickle liquors have 23 contributed to the need for and cost 24 of remediation.

1	Ω.	So :	if I	unders	tand your
2	response	corre	ectly	be	cause in
3	several p	lace	s on :	Page 1	5 you used
4	the words	- may	have	and o	ther similar
5	types of]	phra	ses.		
6		You	r opi	nion i	s based upon
7	the assum	ption	n tha	t assu	ming these
8	wastes we	re d	ispos	ed of	at the site,
9	do you th	en o	ffer	an opi	nion as to
10	the activ	itie	s tha	t are	being
11	undertake	n un	der t	he ROD	. Is that
12	fair?				
13	A .	Wel	1, I	would	say that I
14	would agr	ee w	ith y	our fi	rst point,
15	assuming	that	thes	e wast	es were
16	disposed	of a	t the	site	would the
17	constitue	nts	of th	ese wa	stes or the
18	form that	the	se wa	stes w	ere disposed
19	of contri	bute	to t	he nee	d for and
				66 at	
20	cost of t	he r	espon	se at	the site.
20 21	cost of t		_		umptions were
	Q .	Wha	t oth	er ass	

MR. HARRIS:

24

Objection.

1	Objection to the form of the
2	question. Vague. Ambiguous.
3	THE WITNESS: I don't
4	recall any other assumptions that I
5	had to make to reach my opinions.
6	BY MS. FLAX:
7	Q. Mr. Vandeven, you are not
8	offering an expert opinion with
9	respect to allocation. Is that
LO	correct?
11	A. That's correct.
L2	Q. And you are not offering an
L3	opinion as to the causes and timing
14	of environmental property damage. Is
15	that correct?
16	A. Well, I would well, I'm
17	not sure I would say that. I would
18	say that my opinion would generally
19	come under the category of causes of
20	property damage at the Boarhead Farms
21	site.
22	The causes of property
23	damage at the Boarhead Farms site are
24	in totality all of the wastes that
	1

1	may have been disposed of there.
2	Q. And when you say all of the
3	wastes, you include under that
4	umbrella not only the defendants!
5	waste but the plaintiffs' waste.
6	Correct?
7	A. I really didn't distinguish
8	between plaintiffs, defendants or
9	individual companies.
ro	I looked at the kinds of
11	wastes that may have been disposed of
L2	and then reached an opinion about
L3	whether or not the constituents of
14	those wastes or the form of those
15	wastes contributed to the need and
16	cost of remediation.
17	Q. So regardless of who the
18	generator was, any wastes that went
19	to the Boarhead Farms site in your
20	opinion contributed to the response
21	actions?
22	A. That's correct.
23	Q. And so based upon that, you
24	are offering an opinion as to a cause
	1

1	of environmental property damage but
2	you are not offering an opinion as to
3	the timing of environmental property
4	damage. Correct?
5	A. No. My opinion doesn't
6	really have a temporal aspect to it,
7	no.
8	Q. And you are not offering an
9	opinion as to the fate and transport
10	of the contamination at the Boarhead
11	Farms Superfund site. Correct?
12	A. Well, I believe my opinion
13	includes aspects that are fate and
14	transport opinions, yes.
15	Q. Tell me what your opinions
16	are that include aspects of fate and
17	transport.
18	A. Looking at the specific
19	constituents of a waste that may have
20	been disposed of there, how that
21	would have behaved at the Boarhead
22	Farms site and why it would have
23	contributed to the need for costs of
24	remediation and looking at the form

1	of the waste, be it in bulk or in
2	drums, and how that would have
3	impacted the behavior and movement of
4	chemicals in the environment and the
5	necessity for cleanup costs at the
6	site.
7	I'm looking at how
8	different constituents or different
9	wastes impacted other wastes or
10	impacted other materials at the site,
11	for instance drums. All those things
12	are kind of fate and transport
13	opinions, I would say.
14	Q. Can you show me in
15	Vandeven-1 where you have a
16	discussion about any or all of those
17	topics that you just articulated?
18	A. Sure. A complete or just
19	in examples?
20	Q. I would like you to be as
21	complete as possible.
22	A. Okay.
23	Opinion 2 starts on Page
24	13. The second bullet includes a

215.564.3905

- 1	
1	fate and transport an opinion
2	based on fate and transport.
3	Q. Are you saying that the
4	whole bullet is related to fate and
5	transport or just portions of that?
6	A. At least portions of it
7	are.
8	There's subjects such as
9	how materials could affect the
LO	permeability in groundwater
L1	elevations and how those can
L2	influence fate and transport of
L3	chemicals, how acidic solutions can
L4	affect the fate and transport of
15	inorganic contaminants, how corrosive
16	solutions promote the degradation of
17	buried drums and the release of
18	material.
19	So all of those are fate-
20	and-transport-related opinions.
21	Q. Okay.
22	A. Let's see, on Page 14, the
23	last bullet, maybe halfway through
24	the last bullet the sentence that

1 starts, "In addition, wastes that do 2 not exhibit the RCRA characteristic 3 of corrosivity (i.e. that exhibit a 4 pH between 2 and 12 and a half) can 5 still promote the disintegration of 6 metal drums. 7 Even near-neutral acidic 8 wastes consume some of the buffering 9 capacity of the soils; this 10 facilitates the migration of many 11 chemicals, for example metals, that 12 are more soluble in acid or basic 13 conditions." 14 That's a fate-and-15 transport-related opinion. Now we are into the bullets 1.6 17 that we talked about before on Page 18 15. 19 The first bullet refers to 20 pickle liquors that may have been 21 disposed of at the site and how the 22 acidity of pickle liquors can affect 23 the mobility of metals in soil and 24 groundwater. That's a fate and

1	transport opinion.
2	The second bullet on 15
3	refers to circuit board etchant. And
4	if that was released at the Boarhead
5	Farms site, the acidity associated
6	with that material can affect the
7	levels and fate of metals in the soil
8	and groundwater.
9	A similar topic in the
LO	third bullet relating to various
11	plating wastes, nickel and chromium
12	plating wastes that may have been
13	disposed of at the site and how the
14	acidity of those materials could have
15	increased the solubility of metals.
16	At the bottom of Page 16,
17	the start of the last paragraph on 16
18	over to 17 is a fate-and-transport-
19	related basis for my opinion, as is
20	the last paragraph on 17.
21	Q. If we can go back to Page
22	14 of Vandeven-1, the runover
23	paragraph at the top of the page, the
24	last sentence of the runover

ſ	
1	paragraph that says, "Such solutions
2	may also immobilize metals that were
3	naturally present in the soils at the
4	site."
5	Do you see that?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Did I read that accurately?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Can you tell me what the
10	basis is for that statement?
11	A. I would have to just
12	quickly go back and look at the whole
13	bullet there. Okay.
14	There again we are talking
15	about corrosive or acidic solutions
16	and not only for the same reasons
1.7	they could mobilize metals that are
18	contained in wastes at the site, they
19	could also mobilize metals that are
20	naturally contained in the soils at
21	the site.
22	An acidic solution will,
23	for instance, dissolve the outer
24	coating of soil particles where many
	1

1	metals reside, and that will mobilize
2	those metals and will dissolve those
3	metals in groundwater.
4	Q. And the basis for that
5	statement can be found in what
6	document?
7	MR. HARRIS: Objection. It
8	assumes it can be found in a
9	document.
LO	THE WITNESS: It can be
L1	found in any basic soil chemistry or
L2	environmental chemistry document.
L3	BY MS. FLAX:
L4	Q. So you don't need expertise
15	in order to make this statement. Is
16	that correct?
L7	A. I think you need expertise
18	in soil chemistry and environmental
19	chemistry, yes.
20	Q. Do you have expertise in
21	soil chemistry and environmental
22	chemistry?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. How have you acquired the

1	expertise in soil chemistry and
2	environmental chemistry?
3	A. Both through my academic
4	training and my professional
5	experience over the last 20 years.
6	Q. In the next bullet, the
7	second part of the first sentence
8	says, "because of the history of
9	waste disposal (documented releases)
10	at the site."
11	What do you mean by that
12	portion of your statement?
13	A. You read a portion of one
14	sentence there. I just want to
15	make
16	Q. Yes. I'm sorry. It's the
17	first sentence and in the middle of
18	the sentence it starts with the word
19	"because."
20	A. Okay. Okay. I'm sorry,
21	can you ask your question again? I
22	just wanted to read that bullet.
23	Q. What is meant by that

1	"because of the history of waste
2	disposal (documented releases) at the
3	site"? What are you intending to
4	mean by that?
5	A. I believe I'm referring
6	there to some of the early 1970s
7	documented bulk releases at the
8	Boarhead Farms site, and I believe I
9	mentioned at least some of those in
10	the opening to my expert report.
11	Q. Can you show me where in
12	your expert report that you reference
13	the 1970s documented releases.
14	A. On page 13. I think we
15	referred to this before where the
16	preliminary assessment report
17	indicates bulk releases of ferric
18	chloride, copper ammonium carbonate,
19	ammonia and sulfuric acid.
20	Q. That's a reference to 1970s
21	documented releases?
22	A. I believe that that's what
23	the PA is referring to, yes.
24	Q. And what's the PA?

1	A. It's the Preliminary
2	Assessment.
3	Q. And did you review the
4	Preliminary Assessment in connection
5	with the preparation of your report?
6	A. I believe so, yes.
7	Q. Back on Page 14 of
8	Vandeven-1, the first sentence, you
9	refer to documents. Can you identify
10	what documents you are referring to?
11	A. The first sentence where?
12	Q. In the second bullet on
13	Page 14.
14	A. I believe that's referring
15	to documents related to the removal
16	action.
17	Q. Can you identify on your
18	Attachment B what documents you would
19	be referring to?
20	A. Specifically, I cannot say
21	for sure specifically, no.
22	Q. Well, reviewing Attachment
23	B, are there any documents that you
24	have reason to believe are the

1	documents that you are referring to
2	in the second bullet on Page 14?
3	A. I would say documents such
4	as EPA 1993, the On-scene
5	Coordinators Report.
6	Q. And you are on what page of
7	your
8	A. B1. It's possible that the
9	1995 Engineering Evaluation Cost
.0	Analysis Report has information about
.1	that also.
L2	Q. Does that complete your
L3	answer?
L4	A. Yes.
15	Q. Mr. Vandeven, have you ever
16	worked in a steel manufacturing plant
17	or facility?
18	A. No, I have not.
19	Q. As a consultant, have you
20	ever worked for a steel manufacturing
21	plant or facility?
22	A. I don't believe so, no.
23	Q. Have you written and/or
24	published any scientific papers
	_ · ·

1	regarding the operation and/or
2	processes at a steel manufacturing
3	facility or plant?
4	A
5	Q. Have you authored and/or
6	published any articles relating to
7	wastes generated from the operations
8	and/or processes at a steel
9	manufacturing facility or plant?
10	A. No.
11	Q. And is it fair to say that
12	you are not analyzing or evaluating
13	the operations and/or wastes
14	generated from a steel manufacturing
15	facility or plant in this litigation?
16	A. That's a fair statement,
17	yes.
18	Q. And is it fair that you
19	don't have any firsthand knowledge of
20	any steel manufacturing operations or
21	facilities?
22	A. Any steel manufacturing
23	operations or facilities? I have
24	some I have in my 20 years of

1	experience I have some experience of
2	steel manufacturing facilities, but
3	no direct experience working for a
4	steel manufacturing facility.
5	Q. What is your experience
6	over your 20 years in connection with
7	a steel manufacturing facility?
8	A. I would say that the
9	primary one would be a case that I've
.0	worked on where there was a steel
1	manufacturing facility it was a
L2	dispute between a steel manufacturing
L3	facility or a facility that included
14	steel manufacturing and my client.
15	So we were looking at the
16	wastes associated with both
17	facilities.
18	Q. Was this a litigated
19	matter?
20	A. It's not a litigated matter
21	currently, no.
22	Q. Was this a recent matter?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Have you been engaged as a

FAX 215.751.0581

1	consultant in this matter that you
2	have just described?
3	Ä. Yes.
4 .	Q. When were you engaged as a
5	consultant?
6	A. I would say maybe two years
7	ago.
8	Q. Can you tell me you said
9	you were looking at the wastes of
10	both facilities. What is actually
11	your charge with this project?
12	A. It has my charge with
13	this project is determining the
14	contribution to a piece of land that
15	both companies owned at one time, so
16	looking at the waste that was
17	generated and potentially disposed of
18	on this piece of land by each entity.
19	Q. And what's your
20	understanding of the wastes that are
21	being looked at with the steel
22	manufacturing or the facility that
23	also contains some steel
24	manufacturing?

1	A. The wastes include
2	almost it's just it's a very
3	long list of wastes from petroleum
4	products to acid wastes to organic
5	wastes. It was a large integrated
6	facility that included steel
7	manufacturing.
8	Q. And are wastes from that
9	portion of the operations that
10	involve steel manufacturing included
11	in your review and consideration of
12	the contribution to the contamination
13	at this one piece of land?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And do you know what those
16	particular wastes are?
17	A. They include both
18	petroleum as I said, petroleum
19	wastes, acidic wastes and volatile
20	organic wastes.
21	Q. And that's limited to that
22	portion of the operations that was
23	related to steel manufacturing?
24	A. No. It's not limited to

1	that. It's limited the entire
2	facility.
3	Q. Do you know what wastes are
4	limited to the steel manufacturing
5	aspect of this facility or do you
6	just know the big picture?
7	A. We are not limiting it to
8	any particular part of the facility,
9	so it's the big picture.
10	Q. And in connection with your
11	work on this particular project you
12	haven't tried to ascertain what waste
13	streams are generated from one
14	operation of the facility versus what
15	waste streams are generated in
16	another operation of the facility.
17	Is that correct?
18	A. No, that wouldn't be
19	correct. That's part of what we are
20	doing, yes.
21	Q. So in connection with the
22	work that you are doing, did you take
23	or have you looked at the wastes that
24	are generated from that portion of

Γ	
1	the operations that were engaged in
2	steel manufacturing?
3 .	A. I don't know if we have
4	specifically looked at that, no.
5	(Vandeven Exhibits 6 & 7
6	were marked for identification,
7	respectively.)
8	MS. FLAX: For the record,
9	I have had marked as Vandeven-6 a
10	November 15th, 2006 e-mail timed at
11	10:57 a.m. from Mark Hawley to Glenn
12	Harris.
13	And attached to it is a
14	draft expert rebuttal opinions of Jay
15	Vandeven, and the date on that is
16	November 15th, 2006, as well.
17	BY MS. FLAX:
18	Q. Do you need a break?
19	A. No, I'm fine.
20	MS. FLAX: And I'm also
21	identifying for the record what has
22	been marked as Vandeven-7, which is a
23	November 15th, 2006 e-mail timed at
24	4:40 p.m. from Mark Hawley to Glenn

1	Harris CC'd to Jay Vandeven attaching	
2	to it expert rebuttal opinions of Jay	
3	Vandeven also dated November 15th.	
4	BY MS. FLAX:	
5	Q. Mr. Vandeven, if you would	
6	turn to Page 7 of Vandeven-6 and Page	
7	7 of Vandeven-7, the last	
8	paragraph well, what I would like	
9	you to do is I would like you to read	
LO	the last paragraph on Page 7 of	
11	Vandeven-6 and the last paragraph of	
L2	Vandeven-7 on Page 7.	
13	A. To myself or do you want me	
14	to read	
15	Q. To yourself.	
16	A. Okay.	
17	Q. Can you tell me how it came	
18	about that the last paragraph on Page	
19	7 of Vandeven-6 was deleted and how	
20	the last paragraph of Vandeven-7 on	
21	Page 7 that runs onto Page 8 was	
22	substituted?	
23	A. Well, I can tell you what I	
24	recall. I think the origin of the	

1	paragraph that's in Exhibit 6 was a
2	generic general opinion about the
3	site-specific nature of doing a
4	and the complexity of doing an
5	allocation of response costs in a
6	site like this.
7	As I said, I was not asked
8	to do an allocation in this matter,
9	and my original report did not
10	include any allocation-related
11	opinions.
12	But then after reading the
13	expert reports from the other side
14	and doing this rebuttal, they seemed
15	to speak to the issue of allocation.
16	So I thought in my rebuttal
17	report I would say something general
18	at the end about the complexity of
19	that process at a site like this.
20	And then I likely determined that
21	that didn't really add anything to my
22	report.
23	And instead I tried to find
24	an example of something specific

nieki jan lyskinari

a	b	0	u	t		t	h	e		C	0	m	р	1	e	x	i	t	У		0	£		t	h	e	:	s	i	t	e	i	a 1	n c	đ
t	h	e		c	0	m	p	1	e	x	i	t	У		0	f		t	h	e		w	a	s	t	e	s		t	h	a	t	1	m a	а у
h	a	v	e		b	e	e	n		d	i	s	p	0	s	e	d		0	f		a	t		t	h	e		s	i	t	e	i	a 1	n d
t	h	e		C	0	m	p	1	e	x	i	t	У		0	f		h	0	W		t	h	e		a	1	1	0	C	a	t	i	0 1	n
p	r	0	C	e	s	s		W	0	u	1	d		n	e	e	d		t	0		c	0	n	s	i	d (e	r		t	h	e		
W	a	s	t	e	s		a	n	d		h	0	W		i	t		b	e	h	a	V	e	d		i	n		t	h	e				
e	n	v	i	r	0	n	m	е	n	t		a	n	d		t	h	e		r	e	s	p	0	n	s	е		c	0	s	t	s		
a	s	S	0	C	i	a	t	e	d		W	i	t	h		t	h	a	t		W	a	S	t	e	•			A	n	d				
t	h	a	t	ī	s		W	h	У		I		s	u	b	s	t	i	t	u	t	e	đ		t	h	e		1	a	\$	t			
P	a	r	a	g	r	a	p	h		i	n		V	a	n	d	e	v	e	n		7	•												
				()	_				в	e	Ł	w	e	e	n		1	0	:	5	7		a		m			0	n					

- Q. Between 10:57 a.m. on

 November 15th and 4:40 p.m. November

 15th, did you speak with Mr. Harris,

 any other attorney at Ballard, Spahr

 or any representative of one or more

 of the plaintiffs regarding your

 rebuttal report?
- A. I may have. I don't recall the time of individual phone calls on an individual day.
- Q. Did you speak to any other attorney at Ballard, Spahr other than Mr. Harris?
 - A. No, I did not.



www.JDReporting.com

1	Q. Did you speak to Mr. Harris
2	regarding your rebuttal report?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Can you tell me what those
5	conversations were?
6	A. Similar to my original
7	expert report, what we discussed
8	the reports that I was rebutting, who
9	they were from, generally what they
LO	contained.
L1	He asked me if anything
12	to look at these reports and
13	determine whether anything in these
L4	reports would cause me to change my
15	original opinion. And that was the
16	general nature of our discussions.
17	Q. Do you recall what
18	conversation, if any, that you had
19	with Mr. Harris with respect to the
20	contents of your rebuttal report?
21	A. I recall having, I would
22	say, maybe two conversations with him
23	about my initial after I looked at
24	the expert reports from the other

	,
1	side, what my initial impressions
2	were, whether or not I thought
3	again, whether or not I thought they
4	would cause me to change my original
5	opinion.
6	Q. And I believe you stated in
7	your rebuttal report they did not
8	lead you to change your opinions. Is
9	that correct?
10	A. That's correct.
11	Q. On Vandeven-6, the last
12	paragraph that ultimately did not
13	make it into your final rebuttal
14	report, you proffer an opinion
15	regarding equitable allocation?
16	And I just want to be
17	absolutely sure, you are not offering
18	an opinion either in your initial
19	report or your rebuttal report as to
20	allocation among the parties to this
21	litigation. Is that correct?
22	A. That's correct.
23	Q. If you would look at
24	Vandeven-5.

1	You would agree with me
2	that Vandeven-5 does not state that
3	drums of degreaser sludge containing
4	TCE that were generated by Handy &
5	Harman Tube Company or the Handy &
6	Harman facility were disposed of at
7	the Boarhead site?
8	A. I don't believe that I
9	reached that conclusion, no.
10	Q. And do you have any
11	evidence or are you aware of any
12	evidence that drums of degreaser
13	sludge waste containing TCE that was
14	generated by Handy & Harman Tube
15	Company or the Handy & Harman
16	facility was in fact disposed of at
17	the Boarhead site?
18	A. Only to the extent that
19	Dr. Brown refers to that waste being
20	disposed of at the site.
21	Q. You say Dr. Brown refers to
22	wastes being disposed of at the
23	site. In Dr. Brown's report, which I
24	presume you read, there was a section

215.564.3905

1	entitled assumptions. Do you recall	
2	that?	
3	A. I don't recall specific	
4	sections of his report, no.	
5	Q. Well, if I represent to you	
6	that there was a section entitled	
7	assumptions and that those	
8	assumptions presumed disposal at the	
9	site, you don't have any independent	
10	evidence that degreaser sludge waste	
11	containing TCE that was generated at	
12	Handy & Harman Tube Company or the	
13	Handy & Harman facility was disposed	
14	of at the site, other than	
15	Dr. Brown's assumption. Correct?	
16	A. I would say that's correct,	
17	yes.	
18	Q. In the last paragraph on	
19	Page 7 of Vandeven-5, the very end of	
20	the third line of that last paragraph	
21	which starts "In response."	
22	A. Okay.	
23	Q. Do you know how much free	
24	liquid was present in the degreaser	
L		

FAX 215.751.0581

1	sludge generated at the Handy &
2	Harman facility or Handy & Harman
3	Tube Company?
4	A. No.
5	Q. Do you know if in fact any
6	free liquid was present in the
7	degreaser sludge generated at the
8	Handy & Harman facility?
9	A. Specifically of that
10	facility, no.
11	Q. Are you aware of any
12	references that would indicate the
13	quantity of free liquid in the
14	degreaser sludge that was generated
15	at Handy & Harman Tube Company or the
16	Handy & Harman facility?
17	A. No.
18	Q. You describe the degreaser
19	sludge or you state that, "The
20	description of the degreaser sludge
21	provided in his" referring to
22	Dr. Brown's "Paragraph 55 does not
23	establish that the amount of free
24	liquid TCE was minimal; materials

1	described as sludges and handled with
2	shovels may contain substantial
3	quantities of liquids."
4	Now, you testified that you
5	don't know how much free liquid was
6	in the degreaser sludge. You don't
7	know if any free liquid was in fact
8	in the degreaser sludge.
9	So is it fair to say, then,
10	that your description of the
11.	degreaser sludges as sludges handled
12	with shovels that may contain
13	substantial quantities of liquids is
14	speculation?
15	A. I wouldn't call it
16	speculation. It may not be it may
17	not be facility specific, however you
18	refer to your clients, Handy & Harman
19	Tube, it may not be facility
20	specific.
21	But from the environmental
22	insult or impact of TCE used as a
23	degreaser is well known to anybody
24	that's practiced in this industry

1	over the last 20 years.
2	And degreasers used during
3	that time and the sludge that was
4	generated by those activities contain
5	free liquids.
6	It was not solid grit metal
7	parts that were generated that were
8	shoveled out of TCE degreasers by any
9	stretch. So it may not be facility
10	specific, but it is absolutely not
11	speculation.
12	Q. Notwithstanding that you
13	don't have any information regarding
14	the quantity or whether there was any
15	free liquid in Handy & Harman's
16	degreaser sludge waste, the basis for
17	you saying that such a statement in
18	this context is not speculative is
19	based upon what?
20	MR. HARRIS: Objection.
21	Asked and answered.
22	THE WITNESS: Yes. I just
23	went through that.
24	Any description of the

1 history of TCE use in this country 2 and why it's one of the primary 3 contaminants in groundwater will discuss how TCE was used, how it was 5 generated at facilities, how it came 6 to be disposed of in the environment. 7 Anybody that's ever looked 8 at the operations of a TCE degreaser 9 knows that the sludge that 10 generated from a TCE degreaser is not 11 solid material, that it contains free 12 liquids, that it contains mobile 13 trichloroethylene and that the 14 materials disposed of from TCE 15 degreasers contains liquids. 16 0. You further state in the 17 last paragraph on Page 7 of Vandeven-18 5, "In addition, if the volume of 19 degreaser sludge was as small as 20 suggested in Paragraph 60 of 21 Dr. Brown's report, the drums that 22 contained the degreaser sludge may 23 well have contained other liquid 24 wastes."

4

1	Do you see that?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Did I read that accurately?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Do you know if in fact the
6	drums or the degreaser sludge from
7	the Handy & Harman facility contained
8	other liquid waste?
9	A. No, I do not.
LO	Q. And you don't know
L1	quantitatively how much alleged other
12	liquid waste might have been in the
13	drums with the degreaser sludge.
14	Correct?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. Are you aware of any
17	evidence that would indicate the
18	quantity of the alleged other liquid
19	wastes that might have been in the
20	drums with the degreaser sludge?
21	A. No, I'm not.
22	Q. What is the basis for your
23	statement that the drums containing
24	the degreaser sludge may well have
	1

1	contained other liquid wastes?
2	A. Simply the fact that if
3	they were going to dispose of a full
4	drum, if they were going to dispose
5	of a drum and it only contained a
6	certain amount of TCE degreaser
7	sludge that they may have included
8	other wastes in that drum.
9	Q. But you have no evidence of
LO	that. Correct?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. So isn't that statement
13	speculative?
1.4	A. I say that it I use the
15	word may.
16	Q. So you would agree with me
17	that it's speculative?
18	A. What I'm referring to is if
19	it did contain other liquids, that
20	the TCE would have partitioned into
21	those other liquids.
22	Q. So that statement that you
23	are making about the other liquids,
24	that's not being made with a

1	reasonable degree of scientific
2	certainty, correct?
3	A. The opinion is made to a
4	reasonable degree of scientific
5	certainty. The opinion is that if
6	there were other liquids in a drum
7	that contained a small amount of TCE
8	degreaser sludge, then the TCE would
9	dissolve into that other liquid.
10	Q. With respect to the free
11	liquid or the alleged other liquid,
12	are you aware of any method that
13	could be used to quantify the content
14	of either of those two?
15	A. I'm not sure I don't
16	understand the question.
17	Q. Well, are you aware in your
18	experience of a means or a method to
19	quantify what part of a 55-gallon
20	drum would contain the degreaser
21	sludge waste and what would contain
22	the other liquid waste?
23	A. Only if you had records
24	showing what that breakdown was.

1	Q. Staying on Page 7 of
2	Vandeven-5, you further state, "The
3	degree to which the TCE was
4	partitioned in the sludge would
5	likely depend on the other
6	constituents of the waste in the
7	drum. If water was present, it
8	probably contained dissolved TCE."
9	Do you see that?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Did I read that accurately?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Do you know if the drums
14	with the degreaser sludge contained
15	any water?
16	A. No, I don't.
17	Q. Do you know quantitatively
18	how much water could have been
19	contained in the drums?
20	A. No, I don't.
21	Q. Are you aware of any
22	evidence that demonstrates that water
23	was in the 55-gallon drums with the
24	degreaser sludge waste?

1	A. No, I'm not.
2	Q. And, again, your opinion is
3	premised upon the assumption of if
4	water was present. Correct?
5	A. The opinion about TCE
6	dissolving into water from a drum
7	that contained both TCE degreaser
8	sludge and water, yes, is premised on
9	the assumption that there was some
10	water contained in the drum.
11	Q. And assuming that
12	assumption, it is in fact your
13	opinion within a reasonable degree of
14	scientific certainty?
15	A. Yes.
16	MS. FLAX: Why don't we
17	take a five-minute break.
18	(Thereupon, at 12:13 p.m. a
19	luncheon recess was taken until
20	1:14 p.m., at which time the
21	following proceedings were had:)
22	BY MS. FLAX:
23	Q. At the beginning of the
24	deposition, Mr. Vandeven, I asked you

1	who Mark Hawley was and you said that
2	he was a hydrogeologist in your
3	office. What role did he play in the
4	preparation of Vandeven-1?
5	A. Mark assisted me in
6	reviewing some of the underlying
7	documents. He assisted me in
8	evaluating the in obtaining
9	documents related to the history of
10	the site, and assisted me in the
11	preparation of the expert report.
12	Q. What exactly did Mr. Hawley
13	do in connection with assisting you
14	in the preparation of the expert
15	report?
16	A. Well, I'm not sure I could
17	tell you exactly. But, for instance,
18	in Vandeven-1 there's a portion of
19	the expert report that provides a
20	chronological summary of activities
21	at the site.
22	I believe Mark helped me
23	put that together, going through the
24	underlying documents, understanding

1	the chronology of the EPA response
2	actions at the site, and drafting
3	those sections of the report.
4	Q. Did you physically write
5	this report?
6	A. Large portions of it, yes.
7	Q. Did Mr. Hawley write any
8	portions of this report, other than
9	the response activity section that
10	you just testified to?
11	A. He may have written other
12	small parts of it. I couldn't say
13	exactly which parts he wrote, at this
14	point.
15	Q. What portion would you say
16	is your effort and what portion would
17	you say is Mr. Hawley's effort?
18	A. As far as the physical
19	writing of it?
20	Q. Well, the overall report.
21	A. Well, the overall report is
22	my report, they are my opinions, but
23	the actual writing of it I would say,
24	you know, maybe 25 percent Mark.

215.564.3905

1	Q. A	and wou	ald the same be tr	ue
2	with respec	t to V	andeven-5, which	is
3	your rebutt	al rep	ort, as to	
4	Mr. Hawley'	s assi	stance in the	-
5	preparation	of Va	ndeven-5?	
6	A. I	t was	probably less the	re,
7	since there	was n	o real background	,
8	information	to su	mmarize.	
9	Т	his wa	as probably more -	· -
LO	his effort	here w	as probably more	
11	related to	review	ing the other exp	ert
L2	reports wit	h me a	and us discussing	
13	what we	gettin	g his input on wh	at
14	he thought	about	those other exper	t
1.5	reports, to	00.		
1.6	P	But the	primary writing	of
17	the rebutta	l repo	ort was mine.	
18	Q. E	Before	the break we were	:
19	talking abo	ut var	cious portions of	the
20	last paragr	aph or	Page 7 of Vandev	en-
21	5.			
22	2	And I h	elieve that you	
23	testified t	hat wi	th the assumption	s
24	that are co	ntaine	ed in those three	
	1			

1	sentences that we discussed, your
2	opinions are within a reasonable
3	degree of scientific certainty.
4	Correct?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. If the assumptions proved
7	untrue, would you have any basis to
8	make the statements that you make in
9	the last paragraph on Page 7 of
10	Vandeven-5, and if you want me to go
11	through each one again I will.
12	MR. HARRIS: Object to the
13	form.
14	MS. FLAX: Okay. Strike
	that.
15	
15 16	BY MS. FLAX:
16	BY MS. FLAX:
16 17	BY MS. FLAX: Q. If the assumption that you
16 17 18	BY MS. FLAX: Q. If the assumption that you make in the third sentence of the
16 17 18 19	BY MS. FLAX: Q. If the assumption that you make in the third sentence of the second paragraph on Page 7 that
16 17 18 19 20	BY MS. FLAX: Q. If the assumption that you make in the third sentence of the second paragraph on Page 7 that starts "in response," if the
16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MS. FLAX: Q. If the assumption that you make in the third sentence of the second paragraph on Page 7 that starts "in response," if the assumptions were unproven, would you